AUG-07-2006 17:28　　HARNESS DICKEY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 0 7 2006

P.08

Application No. 09/936,047
Attorney Docket No. 32860-000171/US

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all of the pending claims, with claims 1 and 9 being written in independent form.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over US 5,974,572 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg") in view of US 5,987,242 to Bentley et al. ("Bentley"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Applicants still believe that the Examiners rejection position is incorrect for all of the reasons set forth in the March 13, 2006 Amendment. For example, Weinberg's Astra system includes objects (as shown in Fig. 8), but the reference does not teach or suggest that the objects themselves may be viewed, requested or worked on. Instead, the output created by the Astra system (i.e., the graphical map of a website) may be viewed, requested on worked on.

Not persuaded, the Examiner counters (at paragraph 2 of the Office Action) that users can utilize a "Dynamic Scan" feature of Astra to append dynamically generated web pages to their maps, and that the above information shows that web sites are created and worked on to create web pages. Thus, the Examiner seems to respectively compare Weinberg's web sites and web pages to the claimed "automation objects" and "automation solution" defined by independent claims 1 and 9. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Weinberg's web sites are not comparable to the claimed "automation objects." This is because a web site is a collection of web pages. A web site does *not* realize a partial web page. In this regard, the Examiner position seems inconsistent on its face. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Weinberg's web sites can not be created and worked on within the Astra system. The Astra system only scans the web sites to create a graphical site map, which can be worked on. As demonstrated above, the "automation objects" defined by claims 1 and 9 are practically and conceptually different than Weinberg's web sites.

Turning to the next point, the system defined by claims 1 and 9 includes a directory for entering and storing object names of the automation objects when created. With reference to Fig. 8 of Weinberg, the Astra system includes a plurality of objects inclusive of a Site Graph Object 114, which corresponds generally to the map of a web site. Thus, the graphical site maps may be considered as automation objects. Weinberg, however, does not show any directory for entering and storing names of the graphical site maps as the automation objects. Fig. 3 of Weinberg shows

Page 6

Application No. 09/936,047
Attorney Docket No. 32860-000171/US

the created graphical map of a web site in which complex web structures and the interrelationship between the data entries of those structures are displayed in such a way that makes navigation for the user easier. Information data with respect to references in the form of URL's (addresses) and interfaces in the form of links disclosed by Weinberg (as well as possibly further information data) do not refer to the graphical site maps as the automation objects but to the content of the websites scanned by the Astra system.

At least for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 9 recite features that are altogether missing from Weinberg. The secondary reference to Bentley does not make up for the deficiencies of Weinberg noted above. Accordingly, even if combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the prior art would still not meet each and every feature of the invention defined by claims 1 and 9.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ray Heflin at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____
Ray Heflin, Reg. No. 41,060

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/HRH:lmg

Page 7